

REPORT OF THE NINTH MEETING

OF THE

CANADA-UNITED STATES
INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

MAY 18-22, 1966

WASHINGTON, D.C.

BY

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Chairman

OF THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DELEGATION

PURSUANT TO

PUBLIC LAW 42, 86TH CONGRESS



OCTOBER 17, 1966.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1966

HOUSE DELEGATION

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, New Jersey, *Chairman*

EDNA F. KELLY, New York

WILLIAM T. MURPHY, Illinois

HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California

FERNAND ST GERMAIN, Rhode Island

JAMES KEE, West Virginia

OTIS G. PIKE, New York

MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont

VERNON W. THOMSON, Wisconsin

JAMES G. FULTON, Pennsylvania

JOHN J. DUNCAN, Tennessee

ALBERT C. F. WESTPHAL, *Staff Consultant*

LOUISE O'BRIEN, *Staff Assistant*

SENATE DELEGATION

GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont, *Chairman*

MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana

EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota

EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine

LEE METCALF, Montana

DANIEL K. INOUE, Hawaii

ROSS BASS, Tennessee

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts

MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine

NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan

NORVILL JONES, *Consultant*

MILRAE JENSEN, *Staff Assistant*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
U.S. delegation.....	ii
Letter of transmittal.....	v
Background.....	1
Composition of delegations.....	1
Ninth meeting:	
Plenary session.....	2
Remarks of Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State.....	3
Committee meetings:	
Committee I—Trade and economic matters.....	4
Report of Committee I.....	5
Committee II—Defense and security.....	9
Report of Committee II.....	9
Meeting with President Johnson.....	16
Other activities.....	16
Visit to Oak Ridge, Tenn.....	16
Conclusion.....	16

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

1. The purpose of this form is to provide a standard format for the collection and reporting of data on the use of the various types of equipment and materials used in the various types of work.

2. The data collected on this form will be used to determine the relative efficiency of the various types of equipment and materials used in the various types of work.

3. The data collected on this form will be used to determine the relative efficiency of the various types of equipment and materials used in the various types of work.

4. The data collected on this form will be used to determine the relative efficiency of the various types of equipment and materials used in the various types of work.

5. The data collected on this form will be used to determine the relative efficiency of the various types of equipment and materials used in the various types of work.

6. The data collected on this form will be used to determine the relative efficiency of the various types of equipment and materials used in the various types of work.

7. The data collected on this form will be used to determine the relative efficiency of the various types of equipment and materials used in the various types of work.

8. The data collected on this form will be used to determine the relative efficiency of the various types of equipment and materials used in the various types of work.

9. The data collected on this form will be used to determine the relative efficiency of the various types of equipment and materials used in the various types of work.

10. The data collected on this form will be used to determine the relative efficiency of the various types of equipment and materials used in the various types of work.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

OCTOBER 17, 1966:

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 86-42, it is my privilege and honor, as chairman of the House of Representatives delegation, to submit a report of the ninth meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, held in Washington, D.C., May 18-22, 1966.

Sincerely yours,

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Chairman, House of Representatives Delegation.

THE CAST OF THE

—————

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

CAST OF THE

Union Calendar No. 1032

89TH CONGRESS } <i>2d Session</i>	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES {	REPORT No. 2291
--------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------

REPORT OF THE NINTH MEETING OF THE CANADA- UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

OCTOBER 17, 1966.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. GALLAGHER, from the U.S. House of Representatives delegation
to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, submitted
the following

R E P O R T

Union Calendar No. 1133

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
1917

REPORT ON THE NINETEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CANADIAN
LABOR COUNCIL

Presented to the House of Representatives
by Mr. J. H. McRae, Minister of Labor

Published by the Government of Canada
Ottawa, 1917

NINTH MEETING OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

BACKGROUND

The relations between Canada and the United States are often cited as an example of what relations between two neighboring States should be. Certainly in the disturbed conditions of the world today they set a worthy example and provide a refreshing experience. None doubts that the spirit of mutual trust has been beneficial to both countries. It is that spirit that has enabled them to carry out many cooperative projects.

Both countries are not only desirous of maintaining this cordiality but, more significantly, of expanding it. To do this requires an effort to achieve a better understanding of each others attitudes and problems. It was a recognition of this need for mutual education that led to the establishment of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group in 1959.

Public Law 86-42 authorized continuing participation by the United States in the Group, provided for the appointment of delegates, and authorized an appropriation of funds for the expenses of the U.S. delegation to the meetings.

The meetings alternate between Ottawa and Washington. The ninth meeting was held in Washington on May 19-20, 1966, after which the U.S. delegates took their Canadian colleagues to Oak Ridge, Tenn., to visit the atomic installations and the Tennessee Valley Authority projects.

COMPOSITION OF DELEGATIONS

The Speaker of the House of Representatives appointed the following Members to the House delegation:

Cornelius E. Gallagher, New Jersey, Chairman.

Edna F. Kelly, New York.

William T. Murphy, Illinois.

Harold T. Johnson, California.

Fernand J. St Germain, Rhode Island.

James Kee, West Virginia.

Otis G. Pike, New York.

Mark Andrews, North Dakota.

Robert T. Stafford, Vermont.

Vernon W. Thomson, Wisconsin.

James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania.

John J. Duncan, Tennessee.

The President of the Senate appointed the following Members to the Senate delegation:

George D. Aiken, Vermont, Chairman.
Mike Mansfield, Montana.
Eugene J. McCarthy, Minnesota.
Edmund S. Muskie, Maine.
Lee Metcalf, Montana.
Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii.
Ross Bass, Tennessee.
Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa.
Leverett Saltonstall, Massachusetts.
Margaret Chase Smith, Maine.
Norris Cotton, New Hampshire.
Robert P. Griffin, Michigan.

The members of the Canadian delegation were as follows:

From the Senate:

Hon. Sydney J. Smith, Speaker of the Senate (British Columbia),
Chairman.
Hon. Sarto Fournier (Quebec).
Hon. M. Grattan O'Leary (Ontario).
Hon. Nelson Rattenbury (New Brunswick).
Hon. Dr. Orville Howard Phillips (Prince Edward Island).
Hon. John Black Aird (Ontario).

From the House of Commons:

Herman M. Batten, Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons,
Chairman.
Hon. Alvin G. Hamilton (Saskatchewan).
Hon. J. H. Theogene Ricard (Quebec).
Donald Stovel Macdonald (Ontario).
Wallace B. Nesbitt (Ontario).
Robert C. Coates (Nova Scotia).
Robert Simpson (Manitoba).
Alexander Bell Patterson (British Columbia).
F. Andrew Brewin (Ontario).
Viateur Ethier (Ontario).
Allan M. A. McLean (New Brunswick).
Robert J. Orange (Northwest Territories).
Reid Scott (Ontario).
David Walter Groos (British Columbia).
Paul Langlois (Quebec).
Rev. David S. H. MacDonald (Prince Edward Island).
Gerard Pelletier (Quebec).
Alcide Simard (Quebec).

NINTH MEETING

PLENARY SESSION

The Canadian delegation was welcomed at the opening plenary session on May 19 in the Old Supreme Court Chamber in the Capitol. Secretary of State Rusk opened the session with the following remarks:

REMARKS OF HON. DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE

Senator Smith, Mr. Batten, Senator Aiken, Congressman Gallagher, distinguished parliamentarians and ladies, it is a very great pleasure indeed for me to be in this historic chamber of the Supreme Court to welcome you to Washington.

President Johnson later today will extend to you his own personal greetings and warm welcome. I have the pleasant privilege of extending that welcome on behalf of the Cabinet and perhaps the Foreign Office, as sometimes it is called.

We hope very much that your visit will be a pleasant one. I am quite sure that it will be profitable. Canadian-American discussions are always profitable. Fortunately, they take place very frequently.

The dialog between the two Cabinets, the two Legislatures, our two peoples is more constant and more open than between any other two nations in the world, and I daresay also more friendly.

It is quite true that our conversations sometimes generate a little heat as well as light, but I think our efforts to educate one another are based on a real desire to arrive at a common understanding. I think it is worth pausing once in a while to realize that wherever there are people, there are problems, and that when national frontiers become involved that those problems get to be called foreign policy problems or international problems.

Since we have so much contact with each other, since we are so interlaced in the ordinary affairs of our peoples on both sides of the borders, at any given moment there are always matters that need discussion, but I would hope we would keep in mind the 1 or 2 percent of the relationships that need discussion against a background of 98 percent of our relationships that are going well at any given time.

I should like to salute Canada's energetic role in the field of peace-keeping. Secretary McNamara commented on that in Montreal last evening, but Canada has stepped forward in this postwar period to take a responsible and active part in helping the United Nations and other international organizations make a little peace in the world.

The troops that you have supplied to the United Nations in various parts of the world, the very important conference which you called last year with several dozen governments represented to study the peacekeeping problem, your role in the International Commission in southeast Asia, all those things are notable and valuable and respected contributions to the peace.

I know that there are times when some of our friends in Canada feel a little pressured by the idea that we somehow expect you to agree with us on a great many problems around the world, and I suppose there are people here in this country who feel surprised or disappointed if our two Governments are not working in the same direction on the same issue.

I would hope we could forget that problem and approach it from a somewhat different point of view. We are both independent countries. We both are proud peoples. I think if each side should go off into its own corner and think long and hard about what kind of people we are, what our purposes are, what kind of world we live in, what kind of world we are trying to build, and then we would come together and compare notes, we would find that we are in agreement because of

our own national interests, our own character, and our own common concept of the world in which we live.

That is not surprising. We have had a great deal of the same experience. We have taken full note of the fact that Britain went to particular pains to get rid of its American colonies before they invented the Commonwealth. But having gotten rid of us, Canada proved to be the bellwether, the pattern, for the evolution of empire through the State of Westminster and other moves, to an association of friendly and wholly independent nations.

You and we are vigorous democracies, sometimes boisterous democracies, and you and we both have been drawn into two world wars out of events which started somewhere else, started outside of this Western Hemisphere and you and we made a very large and painful contribution to those two World Wars. And you and we joined with others before the shooting was stopped in World War II to think very deeply about what kind of world it is we wanted to build, and to try to draw the lessons of World War II and to try to organize the peace.

I think the greatest single common tie between our two countries in this postwar world can be found in the preamble and articles I and II of the United Nations Charter: How to organize the peace, how to learn the lessons of World War II, and how to remember them long enough to prevent world war III because we shall not have a chance to draw the lessons from World War II and try again.

We have got to do that in advance. And so I think that we would find that as we try to build that kind of world that Canada and the United States will be working in the closest cooperation and partnership, that Canada's voice of sanity and moderation is an important voice in a world which is still filled, unhappily, with tension, turmoil, controversy, and tragically still bloodshed. But Canada's role is a role of genuine leadership among the nations. It is no accident when the United Nations starts looking for people who might go over and take on a job that requires wisdom and judgment and balance, that the question so frequently arises: Is there a Canadian who is available to take this job on? It is a great tradition you have established, a great service, and we value it very much.

So I know your discussions are going to be beneficial to both sides, and I assure you that I myself will be following those discussions with greatest interest. We will be having another joint Cabinet discussion before not too long; this time we will be in Canada, and we could get on with that great partnership which means so much to our two peoples.

Thank you very much for a chance to let me come and greet you, and extend you my very best wishes for a good meeting.

Thank you very much.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Following the plenary session, the delegations divided into two panels for discussion, as follows:

Committee I—Trade and Economic Matters

Members of the U.S. delegation participating in Committee I discussions were: Representatives Johnson, St Germain, Kee,

Andrews, and Duncan; Senators Aiken (Co-chairman), McCarthy, Muskie, Metcalf, Bass, Cotton, and Griffin.

Members of the Canadian delegation on Committee I were: Senators Smith (co-chairman), Fournier, O'Leary, and Aird; Members of the House of Commons: Messrs. Hamilton, Ricard, Coates, Simpson, McLean, Scott, Langlois, Orange, and Ethier.

The following topics were on the agenda for Committee I: (1) Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations, (2) balance-of-payments problems, (3) aid to developing countries, (4) water pollution, and (5) improvement of Richelieu-Champlain Waterway.

On completion of the panel meetings on May 19 and 20, the following report was issued:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE I—TRADE AND ECONOMIC MATTERS

KENNEDY ROUND OF TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS

Initial discussion of the Committee on Trade and Economic Matters centered on the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations. Both delegations agreed that the United States and Canada share a fundamental interest in the ultimate success of the negotiations since substantial liberalization of world trade would benefit all participating countries. The delegates exchanged views on the problems posed for the two countries by current policies of the European Economic Community, particularly by the attempts of the Common Market countries to reach a common price for agricultural products.

The U.S. delegation expressed the hope that barriers to the successful completion of the Kennedy Round could be surmounted and that highest priority could then be given to the timely completion of these negotiations. The Canadian delegation expressed its hope that the United States will continue to provide the strong support for trade liberalization that it has provided in the past. The American delegation noted that as efforts at liberalization of trade proceed, the United States will continue to seek adequate adjustments for American industries and agricultural sectors that could be injured by the process. The Canadians urged that both countries explore the problems posed by the relationship between developing nations and the industrialized nations.

The Committee discussed current problems of trade between the United States and Canada. The Canadian delegation pointed out its concern with restrictions on the entry of certain Canadian products into the United States. The United States pointed to the recent increase in the quota on Cheddar cheese as an example of its recognition of that concern. Both delegations noted the need for the two countries to continue to work closely in all aspects of trade, including the negotiation of a world cereals agreement in which the two North American exporting countries have a strong interest.

Balance of Payments

The Committee on Trade and Economic Matters discussed the continuing balance-of-payments deficit in both the United States and Canada. The two delegations exchanged views on the advantages and disadvantages of the present international monetary system. The Canadian delegation pointed out the problem of gold reserves, discussed the difficulties that might arise from arbitrarily changing the value of gold, and discussed the possibility of moving to a new international unit. Both agreed that this is a problem that only government-to-government consultations can resolve.

The Canadian delegation pointed out that the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States and Canada arise from different causes in each country. While the United States exports large amounts of liquid capital, Canada runs both a trade and an interest and dividend payment deficit.

The U.S. delegation pointed out that the huge investment by American citizens in Canada is a factor in aiding the Canadian balance of payments and has played an important part in the economic development of Canada. The Canadians noted the importance of the United States continuing to allow the free movement of funds across the common border.

The U.S. delegation expressed its confidence that no head tax will be placed on American tourists going to Canada. The Canadians emphasized their interest in this question, especially with the planned world's fair, EXPO '67, in Montreal next year. The Canadian delegation also expressed the hope that the United States would increase the limit on the goods that tourists can bring back from Canada duty free. The Canadians stressed that Canada may pursue an economic policy combining elements of self-interest as well as those of an international outlook. Each delegation asked that careful consideration be given to its balance-of-payments problems.

Aid to Developing Countries

The Committee discussed the trade and development problems of the developing nations. The Canadian delegation pointed out the widening gap between the economies of the developed and developing countries and urged consideration of means of enabling the "third world" to attain a higher living standard. Among suggested alternatives to direct grants and gifts of food were international commodity agreements on the price and production of primary products. The Canadian delegation pointed out that such an agreement might also be expanded to include certain classes of manufactured goods. Another method discussed was the possible establishment of international trading companies, either government or private, which would allow developing nations to market more efficiently their primary products. The delegations further recognized the need for self-help measures by developing countries and increased aid efforts by private organizations and international bodies.

Both delegations acknowledged the problems involved in foreign aid. The U.S. delegation remarked that in many cases U.S. aid funds have been misused or misapplied in the recipient countries. The U.S. representatives pointed out the necessity of choosing carefully the recipients of foreign aid and the techniques to be used in each situation. The Canadians expressed the view that more low-interest long-term loans should be granted to developing countries. The U.S. delegation suggested that more emphasis should be placed on the development of cooperatives, improvement of local banking institutions, and other such means of financing development. Both delegations agreed that the problem of foreign aid merits increased study and review by both countries.

Water Pollution and Water Development

The Canadian delegation presented an opening statement on water pollution. Though North America has been blessed with enormous fresh water resources, carelessness and a lack of interest have made little more than cesspools of many of our great rivers and lakes. While the cost will be heavy, measures must now be commenced throughout North America to rectify past and present courses of pollution. In Canada, however, there is an additional problem in that jurisdiction over water is divided between the Federal and Provincial governments, and the Canadian delegation expressed the hope that suitable legislation could be passed in Canada to place the development of water resources under the Federal Government. Such a policy would allow constructive measures to be started and could lead to a North American resource development program for water.

The U.S. delegation concurred in the importance of a fresh water supply and in the need for increased action to solve the common problem of water pollution. U.S. representatives detailed some of the measures the United States is taking or considering to deal with water pollution, for example, through joint efforts by the State and Federal Governments, through desalinization of sea water, and through transport of clean water to needy areas.

The Americans, however, acknowledged the great need for more careful use and preservation of water resources and stressed the importance of additional Government emphasis on solving this problem. The Canadian delegation called for the establishment of more effective intergovernmental machinery between the United States and Canada to stimulate increased common cooperation and action to preserve water resources. They suggested that the International Joint Commission might be utilized to advise on the initiation of such a joint effort. The U.S. delegation concurred in this recommendation. The Canadian delegation posed the question of whether or not an amendment to the boundary waters treaty to specifically include water pollution under the treaty might overcome some constitutional difficulties.

The two delegations exchanged views on the proposed North American water and power alliance between the

United States and Canada. The U.S. representatives drew the attention of the Committee to the growing U.S. need for increased supplies of clean water and suggested the possibility of using water from Canada and Alaska. The U.S. delegation pointed out that the possibility of a 5-year study of this problem is under consideration. The Canadian delegates pointed out that their Government has initiated a study of this problem and it is not in a position to take any action until the final report is received.

Improvement of Richelieu-Champlain Waterway

The U.S. delegation initiated the discussion of the Richelieu-Champlain Waterway by outlining the past consideration given to the problem of improving this waterway. U.S. representatives reminded the Committee of the recent report of the International Champlain Waterway Board, set up under the auspices of the International Joint Commission, which stated that the Board had found no evidence that an improved waterway would contribute significantly to the economies of Canada and the United States. Both delegations pointed out, however, that in their view an improved waterway would encourage increased use of the canal for recreational purposes and would lead to stimulation of commercial activities in the area. The Canadian delegation noted that strong local support for improvement of the waterway and recognition of the need for providing entries to the canal system at both Montreal and Sorel exists along the canal.

The delegations were in agreement that in addition to waterways, the two countries also have common transportation interests because of interconnecting highways, railroads, pipelines, and airlines. The U.S. representatives expressed the hope that the two countries would devote increased attention to this common interest and, specifically, that the 1967 meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group would study the transportation policies in detail.

Alaska Highway Improvements

The Canadian delegation opened the discussion by making reference to the need for Canada to have access to tidewater through the Alaska Panhandle. The Canadian delegates regarded the Alaska Panhandle boundary as an impediment to the development of that region of Canada and urged the U.S. delegation to inquire of the U.S. State Department whether or not adjustments could be made in the boundary to provide for Canadian access to tidewater. The problem was considered so grave that while Canada was not really interested in paving the Alaska Highway, it would seriously consider doing so for access rights. It was urged that the U.S. Department of State consider this problem within the context of a solution to the highway improvement problem which concerns the United States.

The U.S. delegation replied that a bill was pending in the Senate to provide for 50 percent of the cost of paving the Alaska Highway and that many studies had shown that the

paving of the Alaska Highway was economically feasible. There was a need in the Pacific Northwest for more north-south transportation links and that steps should be taken on both sides to speed up the very slow progress in achieving a satisfactory solution to this problem.

Other Items

The Canadian delegation requested the U.S. delegation to study possible revision of two laws considered inequitable to Canada. The U.S. delegation was requested to examine the U.S. requirements concerning the import to the United States of scientific, cultural, and educational films as well as the U.S. requirements concerning the loss of U.S. copyright for works published outside the United States for import into the U.S. market.

Committee II—Defense and Security

Members of the U.S. delegation participating in Committee II were: Representatives Gallagher (co-chairman), Murphy, Pike, Stafford, and Thomson; Senators Mansfield, Inouye, Hickenlooper, Saltonstall, and Margaret Chase Smith.

Members from the Canadian delegation were: Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons Herman Batten (co-chairman), Senators Phillips and Rattenbury. Members of the House of Commons: Messrs. Donald S. Macdonald, Nesbitt, Patterson, Brewin, Groos, David MacDonald, Pelletier, and Simard.

The following topics were on the agenda for Committee II: (1) NATO, (2) military assistance to developing countries, (3) U.N. peacekeeping operations and U.N. finances, and (4) problems of southeast Asia. On completion of the panel meetings on May 19 and 20, Committee II issued the following report:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE II—DEFENSE AND SECURITY MATTERS

During the first session of the Committee on Defense and Security Matters, the delegates gave most of their attention to the current crisis in NATO. Several Canadian and American delegates noted that the United States and Canada faced some common problems as a result of General de Gaulle's recent initiatives, since both countries at present have military installations and troops in France which must be moved in the near future.

It was recognized that negotiations with the French Government on many matters would be necessary and that it would be important to insure an equitable settlement of the costs involved.

While recognizing that the 14 allies of France face difficult and complex decisions in the coming months, several Canadian delegates expressed the hope that NATO members would continue to exercise restraint in their dealing with the French Government. These delegates thought that recriminations should be avoided and that every effort should be made to reach practical arrangements for con-

tinuing cooperation between NATO and France. In this connection, it was noted that a number of urgent questions were pending: The future status of French forces stationed in West Germany; NATO overflights of French territory; and access by NATO members to NATO infrastructure facilities in France in case of an emergency.

A number of Canadian delegates expressed the opinion that General de Gaulle had not closed the door to negotiations on these subjects and that these negotiations should be undertaken promptly. In response, several American delegates expressed the belief that great damage had already been done to the organization and ventured doubts that negotiations could remedy that damage. They suggested that it would be difficult to maintain NATO as a viable military organization without active French participation. They also expressed concern that the conventional defense capabilities of NATO would be affected by French withdrawal.

The future structure and purpose of NATO were examined. A number of delegates expressed the view that careful thought should be given to the possibility of adjusting the organization to better achieve the objective of a settlement in Europe rather than allow it to become simply a means of maintaining the status quo. In this connection the possibility of a nuclear free zone was discussed but several delegates commented on the difficulty of deemphasizing nuclear defense in Europe during a period when the territory of France would not be available for the deployment of forces capable of defensive action with conventional weapons. This did not, however, mean that there should not be a change in emphasis within NATO from an essentially defensive organization to one in which there would be greater scope for diplomacy and the working out of initiatives vis-a-vis members of the Warsaw Pact should it appear that Eastern Europe gave promise of their being productive.

The future location of the NATO Council, the NATO military headquarters, and the NATO Military Committee were discussed. A number of delegates considered that there would be important disadvantages in having the Council and the military headquarters widely separated. The view was expressed, however, that there would be equally important advantages in retaining the Council in Paris in the interest of maintaining as many ties as possible between France and other members of the Alliance. A number of delegates regarded it as important that both the Council and the military headquarters should remain on the European Continent. As regards the removal of the Military Committee from Washington, several U.S. delegates observed that, given the extent of U.S. military involvement it would not be in the interest of efficiency to modify the practical working arrangements now in effect between the Committee and the U.S. Department of Defense.

The Committee turned its attention briefly to the unsolved problem of nuclear sharing in the Alliance. It was generally

agreed that the proposed MLF and ANF projects had made little headway. There was some feeling that the McNamara strategy committee might represent a more feasible approach to the problem of greater participation by non-nuclear allies in setting guidelines for the control and use of nuclear weapons. A number of delegates agreed that renewed consideration of "hardware solutions" to the nuclear sharing problem ought to be postponed until the Alliance had adjusted to the changes made necessary by French withdrawal from NATO and had reevaluated the general political situation in Europe.

The Committee discussed briefly the prospects for closer economic relations between members of the Alliance and Eastern Europe. It was observed that Canada had a somewhat more liberal trading policy toward these countries and the question was posed whether there were any prospects for a move in this direction by the United States. In response, members of the U.S. delegation drew attention to recent proposals by the President of the United States in that regard. Serious reservations regarding the desirability of facilitating this trade had been expressed in Congress, however, and it seemed unlikely that these proposals would receive the support of Congress this year. It was also pointed out that there could be no support for the relaxation of restrictions agreed among NATO countries on the export of strategic goods to countries which might divert them to China or North Vietnam.

The Committee received from the Canadian delegation an account of the problems that have arisen in connection with peacekeeping operations in which Canada and other countries have been engaged. These problems, it was pointed out, are related to important questions that confront the United Nations itself such as the question of whether the United Nations should be a forum for negotiations or should have executive authority of its own and that of the extent to which the United Nations can properly become involved in the domestic affairs of its members. To these problems of a conceptual nature was added the problem of financing peacekeeping caused by the refusal of certain countries to pay their assessed shares of the costs of some of these operations. Reference was made to Canada's extensive experience in United Nations peacekeeping operations which had prompted the Canadian Government to convene a conference last year on the technical aspects of peacekeeping operations. This conference, attended by representatives of governments which had provided forces for peacekeeping under United Nations auspices resulted in useful exchanges of views and information on such matters as training and arms and equipment most appropriate for various types of operation. An account was also given of the manner in which the Secretary General of the United Nations sought the cooperation of members to provide forces which were earmarked by governments for United Nations service. It was observed that the current reorgani-

zation of Canadian defense forces would enable Canada to improve the effectiveness of its contributions.

In the discussion which followed, several U.S. delegates drew attention to the disproportionate share of the financial burden of the United Nations peacekeeping operations which was borne by the United States. It was agreed that subject to each operation being considered individually, it was desirable to limit, so far as possible, the share of the cost borne by all countries to their normal percentage share of United Nations programs. At the same time the Committee recognized that though serious financial burdens were created by the absence of agreement on a formula for allocating the costs of United Nations peacekeeping, both past and future, these burdens were infinitesimal in comparison to the costs of war. This fact taken together with the prospect that there will be a substantial increase in the number of countries possessing a capacity to manufacture nuclear weapons in the next few years made it evident, in the view of some delegates, that there will be an increasing need for a corresponding United Nations peacekeeping capacity. The hope was expressed that negotiations leading to the adoption of a generally acceptable formula for allocating United Nations peacekeeping costs would be concluded successfully in the coming months.

The Committee also discussed the practical political limits of United Nations peacekeeping operations. Reference was made to the difficulty of having United Nations forces operating on the territory of a state which is not a member of the United Nations. Some members of the Canadian delegation saw this as an insuperable obstacle to the employment of such forces in such areas as Vietnam or on the borders of China.

This led directly to a lively discussion of Communist China. Two related problems particularly concerned the delegates. First, is the possible admission of Communist China to the U.N. desirable and what difficulties would admission of Communist China create for the organization? Second, should policies tending to isolate Communist China in the world community be modified and especially what might be the advantages and disadvantages of Canadian recognition of the Chinese Communist government at some future time?

There was general agreement among the delegates that if Communist China were to be admitted to the U.N., some kind of two-China solution might be necessary, a solution to which both Nationalist China and the Communist Chinese remain, however, firmly opposed. There was also general agreement that if and when the admission of Communist China was approved by the General Assembly of the U.N., the problem of which Chinese government would occupy China's permanent seat on the Security Council would be a particularly difficult one to resolve. It was noted, however, that while many advocate the admission of Red China to the U.N., no evidence has yet surfaced that China is associating itself with joining the United Nations.

Several American delegates expressed the view that Communist China should not be admitted to the U.N. until that country showed a definite inclination to abandon its aggressive declarations and pattern of behavior. They remarked that admission of Communist China would mean abandoning the standards for admission set out in the U.N. Charter, and would in effect be giving a stamp of approval to Communist China's generally aggressive stance. They added that the U.S. Government maintained regular contacts with the Communist Chinese government through talks in Warsaw and that these talks had revealed no new disposition on the part of the Communist Chinese to modify their own unacceptable conditions for U.N. membership. Concern was expressed by several Canadian and American delegates over the possibility that Communist China if admitted to the U.N. might seek to thwart the work of the organization in various areas.

A number of Canadian delegates agreed with their American counterparts that Communist China had not yet shown any disposition to compromise in order to gain U.N. membership, which it seemed at times that China preferred to remain outside the United Nations. They thought, however, that too much emphasis should not be given to the problem of standards for admission. It was their belief that a number of present members of the organization had clearly violated the U.N. Charter at various times since the establishment of the organization, and that several members of the organization had at times shown a tendency toward abusive language and aggressive behavior on the international scene. They attached more importance to bringing Communist China into the community of the U.N. which might lead to some gradual changes in Communist Chinese attitudes than to a rigid adherence to standards for admission that would inevitably exclude Communist China. A number of Canadian delegates expressed considerable interest in recent statements by U.S. officials in which they saw evidence that some evolution was taking place in U.S. thinking on the problem of Communist Chinese membership in the U.N.

Consideration of the problem of U.N. membership for Communist China led to a brief discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of following policies tending to isolate Communist China. Several Canadian delegates expressed the opinion that a policy of isolation carried increasing dangers, especially with Communist Chinese development of a nuclear capability well advanced. They thought that increased contacts between Western nations and Communist China could help to eliminate misconceptions about the West in China and could lead to more moderate behavior on the part of the Communist Chinese.

In this connection they noted that there was some evidence that a majority of Canadians favored Canadian recognition of Communist China. There is sentiment in Canada to recognize a nation with which Canada has important trade

ties and there is interest in furthering the long-term objective of a reconciliation between Communist China and the West.

Some American delegates expressed their disagreement with the idea that increased contacts with Communist China would encourage the growth of moderation in that country. They suggested that there was some justification for a continued policy of isolation, and thought that only a firm unrelenting Western stance could lead China to change its ways. In response to a Canadian inquiry as to how Americans would receive Canadian recognition of Communist China, several American delegates frankly said that the move would be unpopular in the United States, especially given the current situation in Vietnam. However, some American delegates felt this was a problem for Canada to decide as viewed through its own national interest. In fact it may serve a useful purpose to the West. They urged that careful consideration be given to proper timing if Canada should be led to consider such a step. There was some disagreement among the delegates as to whether American attitudes toward China were softening. There was general agreement, however, that close relations of mutual confidence between the United States and Canada would not be adversely affected by differences in Canadian and American viewpoints concerning Communist China.

During the third session, the Committee received an account of the current situation in Vietnam from a member of the U.S. delegation who had recently visited southeast Asia as a member of a congressional subcommittee. It was noted that the subcommittee had concluded that from the military standpoint the war in South Vietnam was going well. South Vietnamese troops and forces aiding them were taking the initiative in all major military areas, and there were no significant shortages of equipment. There was some confidence that the initiative could be maintained during the rainy season. The subcommittee had been impressed by the intensified efforts being made in the civic action field. They had visited a number of recently liberated villages and had received the definite impression that the villagers welcomed the United States and South Vietnamese military presence. This presence meant that villages could receive long-needed medical attention, could harvest their rice free from Vietcong levies, and could make a start on reestablishing schools and local self-government. Medical assistance to the civilian population and agricultural extension work were two areas in which there was room for greater efforts and where aid from countries such as Canada was greatly appreciated. The subcommittee had been able to observe that the great bulk of military equipment captured from Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces was modern equipment clearly marked as of Chinese Communist origin. Several U.S. delegates remarked that the present political situation in South Vietnam was very disquieting. They did not see any feasible alternatives for the time being, however, to the

present course of action being followed by the U.S. Government.

* * * * *

Members of the Canadian delegation described the wide differences of opinion that exist among the Canadian public regarding Vietnam ranging from advocacy of Canadian military involvement to strong criticism of U.S. policy. Canada's position as a member of the International Committee for Supervision and Control precludes Canada from becoming involved militarily in Vietnam. A number of Canadian delegates expressed the view that the International Commission was an extremely important agency by which it may be possible to make a significant contribution to the achievement of a negotiated solution. There was, however, a desire on the part of the Canadian public to make a more immediate and tangible contribution to the Vietnamese people and this has been reflected by the action of the Canadian Government in sending medical assistance teams to South Vietnam. Several Canadian delegates spoke of expanding and increasing this type of assistance.

Members of the U.S. delegation expressed understanding and respect for the Canadian position and commended the provision of medical and other forms of assistance to alleviate the sufferings of the Vietnamese people. They referred to the repeated efforts of the U.S. Government to enter into negotiations without any evidence being provided by the other side of a willingness to enter into negotiations. They continued to hope that circumstances would develop which would make negotiations possible and thought the integrity of the International Commission should be maintained to assist in this regard.

There was discussion of the implications for the whole of southeast Asia and international relations generally of what is taking place in Vietnam. Some Canadian delegates commented on the inhibiting effect on efforts to achieve agreement in such fields as nonproliferation of nuclear weapons of the Vietnam war. It seemed that so long as that war continued, progress in many areas of international concern would be slow or nonexistent. Members of the U.S. delegation pointed out that the pattern of subversion and terror which had started in Vietnam was now appearing in other areas such as the northern part of Thailand. It was therefore vital that Communist tactics in Vietnam should not be allowed to succeed or the whole area would be lost to communism.

Members of the Canadian and United States delegations recognized that there would be differences of opinion both in Canada and the United States on the best means of achieving the objective of a restoration of peace and stability in southeast Asia. They were, however, united in the view that the U.S. Government had been striving earnestly to this end; and expressed their sympathy for and support of the U.S. President.

Following the completion of formal discussions, the Canadian and United States cochairmen held a press conference and released the reports of the two panels and responded to questions from the press.

MEETING WITH PRESIDENT JOHNSON

On Thursday, May 19, President Johnson received the Canadian delegates at the White House. They were accompanied by the U.S. cochairmen.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

The Ambassador of Canada and Mrs. Ritchie hosted a reception for the two delegations.

The U.S. delegation honored the Canadian delegation at luncheon on Thursday, May 19, and also at a banquet on Thursday evening at which distinguished guests from the Congress, the Department of State, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the International Joint Commission and other agencies of the Government, as well as the Canadian Embassy, were present.

The Canadian delegation visited the Senate and House of Representatives and met with Speaker McCormack.

VISIT TO OAK RIDGE

On Friday, May 20, the delegations visited Oak Ridge, Tenn., and toured the Melton Hill Dam operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Group also toured the Oak Ridge National Laboratory for briefings at the X-10 reactor, the Oak Ridge research reactor, and the isochronous cyclotron. The Group also visited the American Museum of Atomic Energy.

The delegations appreciated the assistance and cooperation of Dr. A. M. Weinberg, Director, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; Dr. C. E. Larson, vice president, Union Carbide Corp.; Mr. S. R. Sapirie, Manager, Oak Ridge Operations; Hon. Aubrey J. Wagner, Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn.; and Hon. Frank Smith, member of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and all the personnel connected with the Oak Ridge Operations and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The briefings were excellent and the visit was a most profitable and informative one.

CONCLUSION

A review of the discussions carried on in the two committees reveals the range of interest of the participants. The printed record, however, does not show the candor and informality that marked the presentation of viewpoints by members of the two delegations. This was made possible by observance of the time-honored rule that all remarks are made without attribution to any individual. It was the consensus of all the delegates that these ingredients made the ninth meeting the most rewarding of all the meetings between Canadian and United States legislators.